

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,993	12/15/2003	Eiji Ogata	JP920030014US1	2964
53493 7590 04/17/2007 LENOVO (US) IP Law		EXAMINER		
Mail Stop ZHHA/B675/PO Box 12195			SONG, HOSUK	
3039 Cornwallis Road RTP, NC 27709-2195			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,		2135		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/17/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/735,993	OGATA, EIJI			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		HOSUK SONG	2135			
	- The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
Period for	Reply					
WHICI - Extens after S - If NO   - Failure Any re	PRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DASSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 DIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period version to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 De</u>	ecember 2003				
		action is non-final.				
'=	,					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
	on of Claims					
4)🖾 (	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) 🗌 (	☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)🖾 (	⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,6 and 7</u> is/are rejected.					
7)🛛 (	☐ Claim(s) 3-5 is/are objected to.					
8) 🗌 (	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
	he drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce		Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		* *			
	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
•	a) ☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	<ul> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage</li> </ul>					
·	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
			-			
Attachment(	•					
1) 🔀 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) 🔲 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  4) 🔲 Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) X Inform Paper	atent Application					

Application/Control Number: 10/735,993

Art Unit: 2135

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-7 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being

unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 10/736016. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2,6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eaves(US 6,351,782).

Claims 1,6,7: Eaves disclose security hardware for storing security key information so that it can be freely read and written in (fig.1#23c). Eaves disclose OS start admission for determining whether or

not input data for user certification is valid when an OS starts based on security key information read from security hardware and admitting the OS to start if the determination result is positive in (col.3,lines 49-55). Eaves disclose OS start type selection for selecting and executing either a first type OS start for generating a system status in which security key information restoration is operable and operating OS start admission or a functionally restricted second type OS start for generating a functionally restricted system status in which security key information restoration is inoperable and not operating OS start admission in (fig.1 and col.3,lines 18-31,49-58). Eaves disclose cancellation means, generated during a period of the second system status for canceling the operation of OS start admission as to the first type OS start and cancel release means for releasing cancellation of the operation of OS start admission after the first type OS start having the operation of OS start admission canceled by cancellation is executed at once in (col.3,lines 49-55;col.13-35).

Claim 2: Eaves disclose input data for user certification is the data keyed in by the user on the first type OS start in (fig.1).

## Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: To clarify the claim language, applicant is advised to avoid the language "(hereafter, referred to as a "first system status") and "(hereafter, referred to as a "second system status")" in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: It is unclear as to what "no" and "yes" applicant is referring to. Appropriate correction is required.

# Allowable Subject Matter

Application/Control Number: 10/735,993

Art Unit: 2135

Claims 3-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable

if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening

claims.

**USPTO** Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to HOSUK SONG whose telephone number is 5712723857. The examiner can normally be

reached on mon-fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KIM

VU can be reached on 5712723859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer

Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR

CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HOSUK SONG

Page 4